



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—CURTIUS AND ARRIAN.

### PART I.

#### *The Narrative in Curtius.*

The story of Alexander is one of the most interesting that has come down to us from antiquity. To what he did and said there was added what he might have done and said, until the later presentations were a strange mixture of fact and fancy. If we judge his history as that of the Romans is judged we must hold that there were incorporated into it incidents not of Grecian origin. As the Romans found in Greek stories materials for the embellishment of their own history, so the Greeks incorporated into the history of Alexander incidents derived from the Hebrews. The story of the Queen of the Amazons was suggested by the Queen of Sheba episode. Onesicritus may be responsible for the transplanting to Grecian soil, but the ground for this belief is itself merely another story; see Plutarch, *Alex.* 46. Along with this story of the Amazon we may place the wonderful whale, Jonah's probably, which appeared while Alexander was besieging Tyre. It was, says Diodorus in 17, 41, 5 ἀπιστον τὸ μέγεθος, and after sporting on the waters for a while, dived beneath the waves, πάλιν δ' εἰς τὸ πέλαγος νηξάμενον, and was seen no more. These two stories were connected by the Greeks with Alexander's history, but we do not know whether we should assign to a Greek or to Curtius himself the fact stated in 5, 2, 7 signum . . . observabatur ignis noctu, fumus interdiu. The true assignment is of little moment, though it has a Hebrew color as have the other two, and we may not be mistaken if we assume that in some way there had come to a Grecian transplanter the original of the words "by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire"; Exodus 13, 21.

Far more interesting than these stories are his deeds surpassing or paralleling those of his great predecessors. He emulated the actions of Perseus and Heracles (*Arr.* 3, 3, 1;

cf. 4, 28, 4), and safely passed through the desert to the temple of Ammon, though the army of Cambyses had been destroyed. Saving a part of his army from the desert of Gedrosia, he consoled himself with the fact that Semiramis had escaped with only twenty of her army, and Cyrus with only seven; Arrian 6, 24, 2. His attitude toward these two is well set forth in Curtius 7, 6, 20 *non alium gentium illarum magis admiratus est, quam hunc regem et Samiramin, quos et magnitudine animi et claritate rerum longe emicuisse credebat*. He showed his emulation of Liber Pater at Nysa (Curt. 8, 10), and in Carmania (Curt. 9, 10, 24). He passed beyond his limits in Scythia (Curt. 7, 9, 15; cf. 3, 10, 5), and to his mutinous soldiers in India he said, *Ne infregeritis in manibus meis palmam, qua Herculem Liberumque Patrem, si invidia afuerit, aequabo*; Curt. 9, 2, 29. These accounts came through the Greek, and we may hold that the motive given in Curt. 4, 6, 29 for the punishment of Betis was due to Curtius himself. His words are *per talos enim spirantis lora traiecta sunt religatumque ad currum traxere circa urbem equi, gloriante rege, Achillen, a quo genus ipse deduceret, imitatum se esse poena in hostem capienda*. This seems nothing more than an illustration of the truth of the words in Arr. 7, 14, 4. *Καὶ κείρασθαι Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπὶ τῷ νεκρῷ τὴν κόμην τά τε ἄλλα οὐκ ἀπεικότα τίθεμαι καὶ κατὰ ζῆλον τὸν Ἀχιλλέως, πρὸς ὄντινα ἐκ παιδὸς φιλοτιμία αὐτῷ ᾔη*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Compositione Verborum* 18, has a short sketch of the siege of Gaza and of the punishment of Betis. He then gives the entire account from Hegesias stating, among other things, "Alexander ordered that a ring of bronze should be passed through his (Betis') feet and that he should be dragged round in a circular course, naked". Dionysius sets over against this Homer's portrayal of the treatment of Hector's body by Achilles, adding that in this "there is not one unimpressive or unworthy verse". The picturing by Vergil (*Aen.* 2, 273 *perque pedes traiectus lora tumentes*), who reproduces Homer (*Il.* 22, 397 *βοέους δ' ἐξήπτεν ἱμάντας*, "hide-bands through the gashes he thrust"), would satisfy Dionysius, and it alone makes an application of the *φιλοτιμία* mentioned by Arrian.

The earliest writings about Alexander have perished, and we have little more in Greek than the collections of Diodorus,

Plutarch and Arrian, and in Latin the work of Curtius and the Epitome of Pompeius Trogus by Justinus. So far as the interdependence of these is concerned it is certain that Arrian made use of Plutarch, and his method was a protest against that of Diodorus. The best evidence showing that Curtius made use of Diodorus are some of the mistakes which appear in both. Arrian in 6, 4, 4 describes a scene at the juncture of the Acesines and the Hydaspes. But Diodorus in 17, 97, 1 places this at the juncture of the aforesaid rivers and the Indus—*τῆς συμβολῆς τῶν προειρημένων ποταμῶν καὶ τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ*. Curtius begins 9, 4 with the statement from Arrian *perventum erat in regionem, in qua Hydaspes amnis Acesini committitur*. There follows in sec. 4 *hinc escensione facta CC et L stadia excessit*, and then in sec. 8 he adapts and explains the words of Diodorus, *Quippe III flumina tota India praeter Gangen maxima munimento arcis adplicant undas. A septentrione Indus adluit, a meridie Acesines Hydaspis confunditur*. Similar to this is Diod. 17, 104, 4 *τοὺς μὲν γὰρ Ἀρβίτας ὀνομαζομένους καὶ τοὺς τὴν Κεδρωσίαν οἰκοῦντας . . . προσηγάγετο*. Curtius has in 9, 10, 5 *Nonis castris in regionem Arabiton, inde totidem diebus in Cedrosiorum perventum est. Liber hic populus . . . . . dedit se . . . . . quam (regionem) emensus in Oritas transit*. Here, as in the other passage, there is an evident blending of Arrian and Diodorus, with the error of the latter retained. The reference to Clitarchus in 9, 8, 15 LXXX milia Indorum in ea regione caesa Clitarchus est auctor, seems to indicate some research on the part of Curtius; but the same number is given in Diod. 17, 102, 6, and the reference to Clitarchus is made merely because Livy, in several passages, refers to Valerius Antias as his authority for the great slaughter of the enemies of the Romans. It is our object to show that Curtius, making direct use of Diodorus, also made use of the material found in the works of Arrian and of Plutarch.

The outline of the career of Alexander is fairly clear as given by Curtius. For the earliest part *fortuna* is predominant (Curt. 3, 6, 18), but the victory at Arbela was due to *virtus* (Curt. 4, 16, 27). The second stage is disgraced by his love of wine (Curt. 5, 7, 1), by feasts (Curt. 6, 2, 1), by the adoption of the customs of the Persians (Curt. 6, 6, 1), by the execution of Philotas (Curt. 6, 7 seqq.), and by the murder of Clitus

(Curt. 8, 1 seqq.). The Indian campaign opens with the scene at Nysa and closes with Carmania, the last before the tragic end at Babylon. In developing the work, Alexander must be over all, and for this reason it was at times not necessary to choose between differing accounts, for either phase presented had the same bearing on Alexander. It matters not whether the wife of Darius died just after the battle of Issus (Arr. 4, 20, 1) or just before the battle of Arbela; whether Bucephalas was stolen in the land of the Uxii (Arr. 5, 19, 6) or in the land of the Mardi (Diod. 17, 76, 7); whether he died at the battle with Porus or some time later; or whether the water-pouring incident took place in the desert of Sogdiana (Plut. Alex. 42), in the desert of Gedrosia (Arr. 6, 26, 1), or in Africa (Frontinus 1, 7, 7). The bearing on the character of Alexander was the same whether Darius offered to Philip in marriage a daughter (Plut. Alex. 19) or a sister; whether Alexander married Stateira (Diod. 17, 107, 6) or Barsine (Arr. 7, 4, 4); whether Leonnatus (Arr. 4, 12, 2) or Polyperchon ridiculed the Persians; or whether it was Nearchus or Meleager (Just. 13, 2, 6) who took part in the discussion of the leaders following the death of Alexander. In these and other instances of the same kind, an exact solution would not in any way affect the coloring of the picture, and it was coloring rather than accuracy for which Curtius was striving. Compare the slightly varying pictures in Curt. 4, 13, 16 and 7, 8, with Plut. Alex. 32.

From whatever source may have come the information given by Curtius, much of it is permeated with Roman color. His characters, otherwise known or unknown, act and talk with the air of characters portrayed by other Romans. In 4, 14, 18 he has Darius apply to Alexander an adaptation of the characterization by Livy in 9, 18, 8. In 4, 13, 8 he makes Alexander say, *furum . . . quippe illorum votum unicum est fallere*, reshaping a part of Hannibal's opinion of the Romans as given by Horace in Odes 4, 4, 51 *quos opimus | fallere et effugere est triumphus*. The characterization of Hannibal by his enemies in Livy 35, 42, 8-14 *exulem illum etc.* suggests the exile Patron as characterized by Bessus in Curt. 5, 12, 2. We find in Curt. 6, 11, 1 *erat inter duces manu strenuus Bolon quidam*, after whose speech, the king (sec. 9) *quamquam in*

vesperam inclinabat dies, tamen amicos convocari iubet. The suggestion for this episode comes from Tacitus, *Annals* I, 16, 9 erat in castris Percennius quidam . . . flexo in vesperam die et dilapsis melioribus deterrimum quemque congregare.

This method may not give the correct coloring to the narrative, but it may perhaps be justified as being within the proper limits of interpretation and of presentation in accordance with recognized types. But Curtius goes beyond this and applies his method to other features as well. In 4, 9, 5 is given a description of the chariots of Darius, based on Diod. 17, 53, 2. The Greek has *προσηλωμένα τῷ ζυγῷ ξύστρα παραμήκη τρισπίθαιμα*; Curtius, utrimque a iugo ternos direxerat gladios, the entire description following Livy 37, 41, 7, rather than translating Diodorus. At times the narrative is so thoroughly Romanized that a comparison of the form of statement in Curtius with that of any Greek author is valueless, unless allowances be made for the Roman element. And in neglecting this some investigators have erred, as does Kaerst, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik des Q. Curtius Rufus*, p. 13. This is also true of other parts of Curtius. Kaerst, p. 21, compares Arr. 6, 18, 4 *Οὐκ ἔχοντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἡγεμόνα τοῦ πλοῦ, ὅτι πεφεύγεσαν οἱ ταύτῃ Ἰνδοί, ἀπορώτερα τὰ τοῦ κατάπλου ἦν . . . καὶ τῶν ψιλῶν τοὺς κουφοτάτους ἐκπέμψας ἐς τὴν προσωτέρω τῆς ὄχθης χώραν ξυλλαμβάνει τινὰς τῶν Ἰνδῶν, καὶ οὕτοι τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε ἐξηγούντο αὐτῷ τὸν πόρον*, with Curt. 9, 8, 30 *ducibus deinde sumptis*; and 9, 9, 1 *quia duces socordius adservati profugerant*. The words do not indicate that Curtius misunderstood the Greek, but that he was mindful of Livy 27, 47, 9 *duces parum intente adservati, alter . . . subsedit, alter . . . tranavit*. The difference between Arr. 5, 20, 6 and Curt. 9, 1, 8 has a similar explanation. The Greek reads *Ἦκον δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν αὐτονόμων Ἰνδῶν πρέσβεις παρ' Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ παρὰ Πύρρον ἄλλον του ὑπάρχον Ἰνδῶν. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ Ἀβισάρην διὰ τάχους ἰέναι παρ' αὐτὸν κελεύει ἐπαπειλήσας, εἰ μὴ ἔλθοι, ὅτι αὐτὸν ὀψεται ἤκοντα ξὺν τῇ στρατιᾷ ἵνα οὐ χαίρῃσει ἰδών*. Curtius has *nuntiari iussit, si gravaretur ad se venire, ipsum ad eum esse venturum*, adapting a statement in Livy 21, 24, 4 *nec cunctanter se ipsum ad eos venturum*, but omitting the important conclusion given by Arrian. Both passages are cited by Fränkel, *Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker*, p. 236, and the conclusion is drawn from them "daraus sieht man, dass

auch hier Klitarch und Aristobul aus derselben Quelle (Onesicritus) geschöpft haben." Bearing in mind the passages from Livy, there is no need of going back of Arrian to find the source for the words of Curtius; compare Curt. 8, 1, 9 which translates Arr. 4, 15, 3 but omits *εἰ κελεύοιτο*. There is a similar relation between Arr. 2, 7, 1 *Τὴν δὲ Ἴσσὸν κατασχών, ὅσους διὰ νόσον ὑπολελειμμένους αὐτοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων κατέλαβε, τούτους χαλεπῶς αἰκισάμενος ἀπέκτεινεν*, and Curt. 3, 8, 15 *quos omnis instinctu purpuratorum barbara feritate saevientium praecisis adustisque manibus circumduci . . . iussit*, the suggestion for which came from Livy 30, 29, 2. The story of the death of Spitamenes in Arr. 4, 17, 7 is varied in Curt. 8, 3 in accordance with Livy's model; see A. J. P. XXXVI 407. The short account in Arr. 3, 7, 5 *Ἀλλὰ διαβαίνει τὸν πόρον, χαλεπῶς μὲν δι' ὀξύτητα τοῦ ῥοῦ, οὐδενὸς δὲ εἰργοντος*, appears in Curt. 4, 9, 17-21 in eighteen lines, a mosaic from Livy, including *sed neque consilium neque imperium accipi poterat*, Livy having in 22, 5, 3 *ceterum . . . nec . . . nec*.

We have already shown (A. J. P. XXXVI 402 seqq.) that Curtius often borrows illustrative material from other Latin writers, and that he often gives his interpretation of events in parenthetical statements similar to those used by Livy. But of more importance are the passages in which he gives the causes of events and actions. Such statements are not common in Justinus, but are very noticeable in Curtius, especially those introduced by *quippe*. A few of the many possible illustrations must suffice: 4, 4, 10 *in altissimam turrem ascendit ingenti animo, periculo maiore: quippe regio insigni et armis fulgentibus conspicuus unus praecipue telis petebatur*. Compare Alexander in a similar situation as described in Arr. 6, 9, 5: *Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ τείχους στὰς κύκλῳ τε ἀπὸ τῶν πλησίον πύργων ἐβάλλετο . . . δῆλος μὲν ἦν Ἀλέξανδρος ὦν τῶν τε ὀπλων τῇ λαμπρότητι καὶ τῷ ἀτόπῳ τῆς τόλμης*; 4, 16, 8 *Dareus . . . dubitavit, an solveret pontem, quippe hostem iam adfore nuntiabatur*; 4, 16, 17 *ne amnis quidem capiebat agmina . . . quippe ubi intravit animos pavor, id solum metuunt, quod primum formidare coeperunt*; 4, 16, 20 *pauci eum sequebantur ovantes victoria, quippe omnes hostes aut in fugam effusos aut in acie cecidisse credebant*; 4, 16, 24 *nec Persae inulti cadebant, quippe non universae acies . . . vehementius iniere certamen*;

4, 16, 31 ne duces quidem copiarum sua laude fraudandi sunt: quippe vulnera, quae quisque exceptit, indicia virtutis sunt. Here Curtius adapts from Livy 27, 10, 7 ne nunc quidem post tot saecula sileantur fraudenturve laude sua, and then gives his reason. Other particles are also used to introduce his interpretations, as in 4, 16, 27 ceterum hanc victoriam rex maiore ex parte virtuti, quam fortunae suae debuit. Nam et aciem peritissime instruxit et promptissime ipse pugnavit. This reminds us of what is said about Hannibal in Livy 30, 35, 5 singulari arte aciem eo die instruxisse. Similar to these are 3, 6, 17 namque haud facile dictu est, praeter ingenitam illi genti erga reges suos venerationem, quantum huius utique regis vel admirationi dediti fuerint vel caritate flagraverint; and 3, 3, 28 ergo Alexandro in acie miles non deficit. These are but a few of the many indications of Roman thinking woven into the account of Alexander. Though they are many, we believe, acting as interpreter of Curtius, that had we his own justification for writing his work, it would be based largely on the orations which he has introduced into it.

The rhetorical and Romanizing tendencies of Curtius are clearly seen in the speeches with which his work abounds. Compared with the narrative they are much more prominent than in Livy. In the army of Alexander there were no short-hand reporters, and no gazetteers to give harangues to the world. For this reason the writers of a later date were, in this respect, untrammelled by facts, and an imaginative Roman might be as successful as a Greek in inventing possible orations. A touch in 6, 11, 12 sermone habito, cuius summa non edita est, can by inference be taken as a suggestion that other orations given were correctly reported. With this can be compared his words in 7, 8, 11 sed ut possit oratio eorum sperni, tamen fides nostra non debet: quare, utcumque sunt tradita, incorrupta perferemus. However, had Curtius wished his readers to believe that the oration was actually delivered, he should have omitted the words in sec. 23 Scytharum solitudines Graecis etiam proverbiiis audio eludi, and those in sec. 21 non succurrit tibi, quamdiu circum Bactra haereas? a manifest adaptation of Livy 22, 39, 16 quamdiu pro Gereoni . . . moenibus sedet!

Curtius could not de-Livianize himself, and for him Livy is an ever-abounding source. Diodorus in 17, 33, 1, and, more



in detail, Arrian in 2, 10, 2, mentions the exhortation of Alexander to his troops at the battle of Issus. Curtius gives it, a page in length, in 3, 10, 4 seqq., drawing on Livy for material. Some legates tell Hannibal, according to Livy 23, 42, 5 glorientur Romani te ad unum modo ictum vigentem velut aculeo misso torpere. This is one of the Livian touches in the speech of Darius, three pages in length, delivered at Arbela to his forces according to Curt. 4, 14, 13 velut quaedam animalia emissio aculeo, torpet. Later on Curtius in 6, 3, 11 assigns to Alexander the words parva saepe scintilla contempta magnum excitavit incendium, a slight modification of a statement in the speech of Hanno, Livy 21, 3, 6 ne quandoque parvus hic ignis incendium ingens exsuscitet; cf. Florus 1, 33, 2, ut scintillae diffudisse quaedam belli incendia. We find in the same speech (sec. 9) et adhuc sic ago, tamquam, as in Livy 10, 8, 1 quid autem ego sic egi, tamquam.

The speech of Hermolaus in Curt. 8, 7 is Greek in origin, for it fills out the outline given in Arr. 4, 14, 2, and has in sec. 14 miraris, si liberi homines superbiam tuam ferre non possumus? = καὶ γὰρ οὐκ εἶναι ἔτι ἐλευθέρῳ ἀνδρὶ φέρειν τὴν ὕβριν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου; and Persarum te vestis et disciplina delectat (sec. 12) is an adaptation of καὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν Μηδικήν, καὶ τὴν προσκύνησιν τὴν βουλευθείσαν καὶ οὐπω πεπαυμένην, καὶ πότους τε καὶ ὕπνους τοὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου. Though the speech is that of a Greek it begins with the words utor beneficio tuo et dico, quae nostris malis didici, an adaptation of the words assigned to Hannibal in Livy 36, 7, 20 bonis malisque meis didici. The listeners interrupt (sec. 7) obstrepunt subinde cuncti Hermolao, just as Appius is interrupted, Livy 3, 49, 5 decemviro obstrepitur. It may also be noticed that the words in sec. 11 novo more victores sub iugum mitteres, reflects Roman and not Grecian custom. As an illustration of the utilization in other connections of short remarks we give the words of a seer in Curt. 9, 4, 29 'ita prorsus futurum' respondisset, recalling those of another seer in Livy 1, 36, 4 profecto futurum dixisset. As three-fourths of the work of Livy has been lost, it can never be determined exactly how much Curtius derived from him. But we can trace so much to Livy and to other Latin writers, that we may well call his work the contributions of a Roman to the history of Alexander. As we can not

separate all that is Roman, there must ever be a feeling of uncertainty in regard to the source of any particular passage. Because of his method, except in cases of evident translation, a study of his sources must be based largely on the facts he has stated. But what are the facts of Curtius?

The narrative of Curtius gives a mixture of geography and of history, using the latter in a very broad sense. The former, changing very little through the ages, might be given with greater accuracy near the time of Curtius than by men who were with Alexander. Some of the geographical facts given by Curtius might have been observed by himself, as the description of the Marsyas in 3, 1, 2-5; of the Sangarius in 3, 1, 12; of the Pylae in 3, 4, 2; and of Cilicia in 3, 4, 6-10. These and some other features might have been observed by him, but this is of little import. The real historical value of his work is in its presentation of facts. And what we call his facts are really a combination of fact and of fancy. It is a fact that the wife of Darius died in captivity; what purports to be his remarks when he heard of her death is fiction. It is also a fact that Darius was captured by Bessus and put to death by his orders; the speeches associated with the two are pieces of fiction. The statement of presumed facts are also of two kinds. Some give us the doings of Alexander and his associates; others set forth the acts of Persians, Bactrians, etc. The former may have originated with the actors or with eye-witnesses of the acts. They were at least committed to writing by Greeks, and were passed down in Grecian literary channels. How the Greeks found out the doings of the Persians when they were far away can not be told; and we may well view with some degree of suspicion the accounts of what took place in the camps of Darius and of Bessus. The illustrative material which Curtius has gathered from Roman sources may be ideally true, but *ab uno omnia disce* is not a safe historical guide. Probably several competent writers described the battle of Issus, but no accumulation of Grecian accounts could produce the Roman coloring found in the narrative of Curtius.

The description of the battle-cry in 3, 10, 2 *iugis montium vastisque saltibus re percussus* is a variation from Livy 21, 33, 6, and to this Curtius adds the comment: *quippe semper cir-*

cumiecta nemora petraeque, quantamcumque accepere vocem, multiplicato sono referunt. Livy in 30, 33, 8 says of the speech delivered by Hannibal at Zama, varia adhortatio erat; and Curtius reproduces this in sec. 4 varia oratione . . . milites adloquebatur. The idea presented in sec. 5 illos terrarum orbis liberatores, is from Hannibal's speech as given in Livy 21, 30, 3 ad liberandum orbem terrarum, just as *emensos* is changed from *emensam* in Livy 21, 30, 5. The simple statement in Livy 21, 43, 8 in vastis Lusitaniae Celtiberiaeque montibus, is changed by Curtius in sec. 6 to in praeruptis petris Illyriorum et Thraciae saxis. In the remainder of the chapter the incentives offered differ from those set forth by Hannibal, but there is equal variety in both.

The ideas and words of Livy are freely used in the description of the battle proper, Curt. 3, 11, 1-15. The construction with the opening words, iam . . . pervenerat, cum . . . invecti sunt, is Livian, but the following comment is that of Curtius: quippe Dareus equestri proelio decernere optabat, phalangem Macedonici exercitus robur esse coniectans. In sections 2 and 3 there are brought together and modified two phrases from Livy, 10, 19, 17 in medio pugnae discrimine; and 22, 48, 5 subductos ex media acie Numidas; while in sec. 4 the words *regem tuebantur* recall the scene portrayed in Livy 22, 6, 3 hostes summa vi petebant et tuebantur cives.

Inaccurate statements and misinterpretations are both found; see Dosson, *Quinte Curce*, pp. 187 seqq. Some of these arise from an improper adjustment of the parts. We are told in 3, 5, 10 that Alexander was worried, quippe Dareum quinto die in Cilicia fore nuntiabatur. Yet we learn from a Darius section of the work beginning with 3, 7, 1 At Dareus nuntio de adversa valetudine eius accepto . . . ad Euphraten contendit iunctoque eo pontibus quinque tamen diebus traiecit exercitum Ciliciam occupare festinans. The five days mentioned in the first passage are taken up in crossing the Euphrates, to say nothing of the time required to carry the news to Babylon. To the same cause we may assign an incident mentioned in connection with the siege of Tyre. According to Arr. 2, 24, 5 some Carthaginian ambassadors were among the captives, and Curtius gives the same information in 4, 4, 18. But Diodorus in 17, 41, 1 tells us that during the siege the Tyrians voted to

send their wives, children and the aged to Carthage, yet owing to circumstances τέλος δὲ τῶν τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν μέρος μὲν ἔφθασαν ὑπεκθέμενοι πρὸς τοὺς Καρχηδονίους, καταταχόμενοι δ' ὑπὸ τῆς πολυχειρίας καὶ ταῖς ναυσὶν οὐκ ὄντες ἀξιόμαχοι συνηγαγέσθην ὑπομείναι πανδημεί τὴν πολιορκίαν. Curtius in 4, 2, 10 and 4, 3, 19 tells us of two embassies, the latter reporting that the Syracusans were ravaging Africa and had pitched camp not far from the walls of Carthage. Immediately the Tyrians gave over their wives and children to be carried to Carthage. This introduces the Syracusan war at the wrong time, apparently removes the legates from Tyre, sends the women into a danger equal to that from which they were fleeing, and renders impossible the conditions described in Curt. 4, 14 *pueri virginesque templa compleverant*. Curtius says in 4, 9, 10 of the battlefield at Arbela *equitabilis et vasta planities: ne stirpes quidem et brevia virgulta operiunt solum liberque prospectus oculorum etiam ad ea, quae procul recessere, permittitur*. This repeats Arr. 3, 8, 7 with *equitabilis* for *ἰππάσιμα*. Yet we find in 4, 12, 23 *nemora vallesque circumiectas* *terribili sono impleverat*. In 4, 12, 14 there is described a sudden panic which fell upon the Macedonians, and in 4, 13, 13 Darius proclaims this fact to the Persians. We read in 4, 9, 2 *idoneis auctoribus fama vulgavit, Alexandrum cum omnibus copiis, quamcumque ipse adisset regionem, petiturum*, although according to 4, 5, 8 this was a part of the answer of Alexander to Darius. He explains the origin of the Argyraspides in 8, 5, 4 (see Just. 12, 7, 5), but mentions them in 4, 13, 27, following Diod. 17, 57, 2.

Occasionally there is an evident lack of care in weighing the import of what is written. Curtius states in 5, 11, 7 *Bessus quamquam erat Graeci sermonis ignarus, tamen stimulante conscientia indicium profecto Patronem detulisse credebat: et interpreti relato sermone Graeci exempta dubitatio est*. As Patron had approached Darius without an interpreter (sec. 4) Bessus performed the impossible feat of remembering and reporting to the interpreter the words of a language which he did not understand. Equally inappropriate is the assignment to Ptolemy in 10, 6, 14 of the words, *est, cur Persas vicerimus, ut stirpi eorum serviamus*. It must have been known to Curtius that Ptolemy himself had married a barbarian, for it is

expressly stated in Arr. 7, 4, 6, though Diodorus in 17, 107, 6 mentions only Hephaestion of the prominent leaders. Here also may be placed Curt. 5, 4, 11 sortis . . . ducem in Persidem ferentis viae Lycium civem fore. This is a translation of Diod. 17, 68, 5 Δύκιον μὲν εἶναι τὸ γένος, but it takes the point from the declaration of the oracle as given by Plut. Alex. 37 "Ὁν φασιν, ἔτι παιδὸς ὄντος Ἀλεξάνδρου, τὴν Πυθίαν προειπεῖν, ὡς λύκος ἔσται καθηγεμὼν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῆς ἐπὶ Πέρσας πορείας.

Other remarks are of a similar character. In 3, 5, 5 he borrows from Livy 30, 30, 1, and by the words, in tanto impetu cursuque rerum omnis aetatis ac memoriae clarissimum regem . . . deictum, makes the soldiers anticipate the coming greatness of Alexander. Also the words in 3, 6, 10 sacro et venerabili ore, are in the spirit of later times, just as in 6, 2, 15 Hecatompylos, condita a Graecis. Because of the lack of marking material Alexander used grain to mark the line for the walls of Alexandria, and yet it is said of this in Curt. 4, 8, 6 ut Macedonum mos est. Just as if he were at Issus, Darius says in 4, 14, 11 coniuges quoque et liberi sequuntur hanc aciem, and finishes with a quotation from Livy. The remark in 6, 3, 16 quadridui nobis iter superest, is too far from the truth to justify its use even in an encouraging harangue. He tells of the marvelous bird and tower at Gaza, inlita erat turris bitumine ac sulphure, in qua alis haerentibus frustra se adlevare conatus a circumstantibus capitur, although Plut. Alex. 25 found in his sources only νευρίνοις κεκρυφάλοις.

The words of Plutarch in his introduction to the Alexander οὔτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν, ἀλλὰ βίους, might be modified to show the design of Curtius "historiam scribimus et vitam". For him the picturesque was as important as the practical, and in the attainment of this 1. *Names* and 2. *Numbers*, were of more importance than matters of 3. *Time* and 4. *Place*.

1. The use of names is the most interesting feature in the study of Curtius. Dosson, pp. 156-7, gives nearly a score of names found only in Curtius. As we know of these only from him, recognizing his interpretative tendencies, we may well believe that some of these are either special creations or specially colored for the picture. Of such are in 7, 3, 4 Amedines, scriba Darei; in 8, 14, 2 Hages, frater Pori; in 5, 13, 7 Melon, Darei interpres; in 8, 11, 5 Mylleas, scriba regis

(Alexandri). The following is pure conjecture; but something can be offered for the belief that the Charus of Curt. 8, 11 is an invention based on the story by Eratosthenes as told in Plut. Alex. 31, see also 58. Yet for the form the prototype is Verg. Aen. 9, 176 seqq. But does the belief that "Nisus et una | Euryalus" suggested Charus et Alexander (sec. 10) hang by too slender a thread? Notice the order of the names here, and the phraseology in v. 222 *statione relicta . . . regemque requirunt*: and in sec. 11 *relictis stationibus . . . regem sequebantur*; v. 386 *evaserat*: sec. 14 *evaserant*; v. 444 *tum super exanimum sese proiecit* (Nisus) *amicum | confossus*: sec. 16 Alexander . . . *confossus undique obruitur*. *Quem ut Charus iacentem conspexit . . . super amici corpus procubuit exanimis*. It is also to be noticed that an adaptation of v. 400 *sese medios . . . in hostis | inferat* occurs in Curt. 7, 7, 37.

Dosson also gives a still longer list of words the spelling of which differs from that found elsewhere. Some of these spellings may be due to original differences, for we find in Arr. 5, 20, 2 *Γλαῦσαι* from Ptolemy, and *Γλανγανῖκαι* from Aristobulus; as also in Plut. Alex. 66 *Σκιλλοῦστιν* and *Ψιλτοῦκιν*; Arr. 6, 19, 3 *Κίλλοντα*. Some of the Latin spellings may go back to Pompeius Trogus, for Justinus has in 12, 8, 9 *Prasios, Gangaridas*, as Curtius in 9, 2, 3 *Gangaridas et Prasios eorumque regem esse Aggrammen*; cf. Diod. 17, 93, 2 *τῶν Ταβραισιῶν καὶ Γανδαριδῶν ἔθνος, τούτων δὲ βασιλεύειν Ξανδράμην*. Arrian has *Αὐτοφραδάτης* in 3, 23, 7 and 4, 18, 2, for which in corresponding passages, 6, 4, 24 and 8, 3, 17, as well as in 4, 12, 9, Curtius has *Phradates*, as if the first part of the Greek name were *αὐτός*. The Latin spellings show many sheer variations from the Greek, and of the genesis of the spelling of such words there is no explanation except improper copying. Some will be given as illustrations; Curt. 3, 4, 1 *Abistamenes*: Arr. 2, 4, 2 *Σαβίκτας*; Curt. 8, 10, 19 *Acadira*: Arr. 4, 24, 6 *Ἀριγαῖον*; Curt. 8, 1, 3 *Attinas*: Arr. 4, 16, 6 *Ἀριστόνικος*; Curt. 8, 10, 22 *Beira*: Arr. 4, 27, 5 *Βάζιρα*; Curt. 7, 4, 8 *Cobares*: Diod. 17, 83, 7 *Βαγωδάρας*; Curt. 6, 7, 2 *Dymnus*: Diod. 17, 79, 1 *Δίμνος*: Plut. Alex. 49 *Δίμνος*; Curt. 8, 12, 1 *Erix*: Diod. 17, 86, 2 *Ἀφρίκης*; Curt. 8, 4, 1 *Gazaba*: Arr. 4, 17, 4 *Γαβάς*; Curt. 9, 1, 35 *Hypasis*, and 9, 1,

13 Hyarotis: Arrian has regularly Ὑφασις and Ὑδραώτης; Curt. 8, 11, 1 Nora: Arr. 4, 27, 5 Ὠρα; Curt. 8, 12, 5, Omphis: Arr. 5, 1, 3; 5, 2, 3 Ακουφίς: Diod. 17, 86, 4 Μῶφίς; Curt. 9, 8, 12 Porticanus: Arr. 6, 16, 1 Ὀξικανός; Curt. 10, 1, 22 Orsines: Arr. 6, 29, 2 Ὀρξίνης; Curt. 9, 4, 15 Sadrucae: Arr. 6, 4, 3 Ὀξυδράκαι; Curt. 6, 4, 4 Ziobetis: Diod. 17, 75, 2 Στιβοίτης; Curt. 8, 1, 8 Phrataphernes: Arr. 4, 15, 4 Φαρασμάνης; Arr. 5, 22, 3 τὸ δὲ ἔθνος τοῦτο τῶν Ἰνδῶν Ἀδραϊσταὶ ἐκαλοῦντο: Indiae is misplaced and misinterpreted in Curt. 9, 8, 11 Inde Praestos, et ipsam Indiae gentem, perventum est, the translation giving a superfluous fact.

These examples indicate that disregard for accuracy or inability to attain it must be considered as a factor in studying the construction of the work of Curtius. Dosson, p. 187, calls attention to mistakes of Curtius, "qu'il confond φόβος avec φοῖβος et le traduit par *Sol*; . . . qu'il a dit '*Ozinem et Zariaspen nobiles Persas*' prenant le nom d'un peuple pour le nom d'un rebelle". But we must acquit Curtius of one of these charges, for he said of Darius in 4, 13, 12 Solem et Mithrem sacrumque et aeternum invocans ignem, while in Plut. Alex. 31 the sentence beginning Δαρεῖος μὲν changes to Ἀλέξανδρος δέ . . . καὶ τῷ φόβῳ σφαγιαζόμενος. The second reference is to Curt. 9, 10, 19, whose words enclosing the quotation are A Cratero quoque nuntius venit . . . defectionem molientes oppressos a se in vinculis esse. The corresponding words of Arrian are in 6, 27, 3 Ἦδη δ' ἐς Καρμανίαν ἤκοντος Ἀλεξάνδρου Κράτερος ἀφικνεῖται, τήν τε ἄλλην στρατιὰν ἅμα οἱ ἄγων καὶ τοὺς ἐλέφαντας καὶ Ὀρδάνην τὸν ἀποστάντα καὶ νεωτερίσαντα συνειληφώς. A mere glance at this shows considerable difference from the Latin, but the Greek has καὶ Ὀρδάνην . . . καὶ νεωτερίσαντα, and Curtius transformed them into Ozinen et Zariaspen, adding the explanation *nobiles Persas*. If this were the only instance of such a possible change it would not be worth mentioning; but there are others in which the alteration is clearly evident. We find in Curt. 6, 4, 23 quibus benigne exceptis ad oppidum Arvas pervenit. Hic ei Craterus et Erigyus occurrunt. The words in Arr. 3, 23, 6 are Ἄρας δὲ ἐντεῦθεν προῆει ἐφ' Ὑρκανίας ὡς εἰς Ζαδράκαρτα πόλιν Ὑρκανίων, and continuing in the next sentence Craterus and Erigyus are mentioned. Here the participle ἄρας, in Curtius *Arvas*, has been taken as the limit

of motion with *προήει*, and the remainder of the sentence omitted. Similar to this is Curt. 3, 7, 5 *ad urbem Mallum pervenit, inde alteris castris ad oppidum Catabolum*, which translates a part and transforms a part of Arrian's statement in 2, 5, 9 *Ἐνθεν δὲ εἰς Μαλλὸν ἀφίκετο καὶ Ἀμφιλόχῳ ὅσα ἥρωι ἐνήγισε· καὶ στασιάζοντας καταλαβὼν τὴν στάσιν αὐτοῖς κατέπαυσε*. Curtius has taken the first participle for *σταδίου*s with some numeral, and the second for the name of a town, and for the same reason as in the passage given above. Arrian has in 2, 13, 1 *Ἐς τετρακισχιλίουs ἔχων τοὺς πάντας, ὡς ἐπὶ Θάψακόν τε πόλιν καὶ τὸν Εὐφράτην ποταμὸν σπουδῇ ἤλανεν, ὡς τάχιστα μέσον αὐτοῦ τε καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸν Εὐφράτην ποιῆσαι*, while Curtius has in 4, 1, 3 *Onchas deinde pervenit, ubi excepere eum Graecorum quattuor milia*. Onchas is "*non aliunde notum*", and with good reason, for it is merely a mutilated *Θάψακος*. There is a strange statement in Curt. 9, 10, 7 *urbem condidit, deductique sunt in eam Arachosii*, but it is due to Diod. 17, 104, 7 *πλησιόχωροι . . . προσεχώρησαν τῷ βασιλεῖ*. Slightly different is Curt. 6, 7, 22 *nobili iuveni—Metron erat ei nomen—whose solution is in Plut. Alex. 49 πρὸς ἕτερον*. Curtius says in 8, 2, 34 *cum equite processit*; in sec. 19 *cum toto exercitu venit*, and in sec. 14 *ipse Xenippa venit*. We conjecture that Xenippa, on the borders of Scythia, is for *ξὺν ἱππεῦσι*; see Arr. 3, 20, 4; 3, 21, 10; 3, 28, 2.

The practical suggestion from the preceding is that it is possible to correct some of the statements of Curtius by means of the words of Arrian. Curtius has in 10, 1, 39 *Phradates regnum adfectasse suspectus occiditur*. Phrataphernes was sent to relieve Phradates of his command (Arr. 4, 18, 2) and send him in custody to Alexander (Curt. 8, 3, 17). He returned later (Arr. 5, 20, 7), and it is improbable that the punishment of Phradates, if he were guilty, would be so long delayed. Notice the promptness of action in the case of Arsaces; Arr. 3, 29, 5; 4, 7, 1. The statement of Curtius immediately follows the account of the punishment of Orsines who is mentioned in Arr. 6, 29, 2, a section which names Phrasaortes and Orsines, while sec. 3 states the death of Baryaxes *Μῆδον συνειλημμένον, ὅτι ὀρθὴν τὴν κίδαριν περιθέμενος βασιλέα προσεῖπεν αὐτὸν Περσῶν καὶ Μῆδων*. It is evident that Curtius has confused Phrasaortes with Phradates, and assigned to him the



punishment inflicted on Baryaxes. Arrian states in 4, 1, 1 that one of the retainers, whose name was Berdes according to Curtius 7, 6, 12, was sent to the Scythians. His return is mentioned in Arrian 4, 15, 1-4 and Curtius 8, 1, 7-10. Both writers tell of the proposal that Alexander take a Scythian as wife. Arrian says that Pharasmenes, king of the Chorasmi, came at the same time, while Curtius has Phrataphernes, qui Chorasmiis praeerat. The latter statement seems to be the result of a two-fold confusion: Pharismanes, son of Phrataphernes (Arr. 6, 27, 3), was first taken for Pharasmenes, and then the name of the father was substituted for that of the son.

In Curt. 9, 10 also there are difficulties in regard to names. Sec. 20 has Menon instead of Thoas (Arr. 6, 27, 1), and Aspastes is mentioned in 21, and in 29 satrapes Aspastes, de quo ante dictum est, interfici iussus est. The information given is far different in Arr. 7, 4, 1 *Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀτροπάτην μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ σατραπείαν ἐκπέμπει παρελθὼν ἐς Σούσα, Ἀβουλίτην δὲ καὶ τὸν τούτου παῖδα Ὀξάθρην, ὅτι κακῶς ἐπεμελείτο τῶν Σουσίων, συλλαβὼν ἀπέκτεινε*. The explanation of the difference is very easy. Curtius took only the first accusative given by Arrian and the last verb, and overlooked all that intervened.

In Arr. 4, 13, 4 is given the name of each of the conspirators with Hermolaus and also the name of his father, *Ἀντίπατρόν τε τὸν Ἀσκληπιόδωρον τοῦ Συρίας σατραπεύσαντος καὶ Ἐπιμένην τὸν Ἀρσαίου καὶ Ἀντικλέα τὸν Θεοκρίτου καὶ Φιλώταν τὸν Κάρσιδος τοῦ Θρακός*. This list of four is increased to seven in Curt. 8, 6, 9 Nicostratum, Antipatrum Asclepiodorumque et Philotan placuit adsumi: per hos adiecti sunt Anticles, Elaptonius et Epimenes. The position of Philotas in the list is different from that in Arrian, and Asclepiodorus is changed from the genitive to the accusative making one addition to the names. The order of the last names is the reverse of that in Arrian, and the strange name Elaptonius appears for *Ἀρσαίου*. The first name Nicostratus is a corruption of the participle *σατραπεύσαντος*, and is changed from its position in Arrian. After passing through the land of the Sudracae and Malli, Alexander, according to Curt. 9, 8, 3 in fines Mallorum devehitur. Arrian has *Σόγδοι* in the parallel passage 6, 15, 4.

But the most noticeable of all the incorrect passages, 8, 9, 4-II, contains a description of the great rivers of India—the

Ganges, Indus, Acesines, Dyardines and Etymandrus. For the usual Greek μέγιστος (Diod. 17, 85, 3; Arr. 5, 6, 7), Curtius applies *eximius* to the Ganges. The description of the Etymandrus, ab accolis rigantibus carpitur: ea causa est, cur tenues reliquias iam sine nomine in mare emittat, corresponds to what Arrian says of it in 4, 6, 6. All these rivers, says Curtius in 8, 9, 3, rise in the Caucasus, and for this reason the Etymandrus ought to be a river of India. Even if it does not flow through India, Curtius is no more to be criticised for including it in the list, than is Longfellow for writing in Evangeline

Westward the Oregon flows and the Walleway and Owyhee  
Eastward, with devious course, among the Wind-river Mountains,  
Through the Sweet-water Valley precipitate leaps the Nebraska,

and then adding

Into this wonderful land, at the base of the Ozark Mountains, which are in Arkansas and Missouri. But the real difficulty in the passage is with Dyardines—minus celeberrimo auditu est, quia per ultima Indiae currit: ceterum non crocodilos modo, uti Nilus, sed etiam delphinos ignotasque aliis gentibus beluas alit. The statements in Strabo 15, 696, and in Arr. 6, 1, 2 Πρότερον μὲν γε ἐν τῷ Ἰνδῷ ποταμῷ κροκοδείλους ἰδὼν, μόνῳ τῶν ἄλλων ποταμῶν πλὴν Νείλου, πρὸς δὲ ταῖς ὄχθαις τοῦ Ἀκεσίνου κυάμους πεφυκότας ὁποῖους ἡ γῆ ἐκφέρει ἐν Αἰγυπτίᾳ, establish the fact that the words of Curtius apply to rivers along the route of Alexander. The description, Indus . . . Acesines eum auget: decursurum in mare *Indus* intercipit magnoque motu amnis uterque colliditur, is puzzling, although a part translates Arr. 6, 4, 4 τὸ ὕδωρ κυμαίνεται τε καὶ καχλάζει, referring to the Hydaspes and Acesines, and it is from the first part of the one and the last of the other that Curtius seems to have formed Dyardines. The patent defect is the omission of Hydaspes. Supplying this the reading should be, Indus . . . Acesines eum auget: decursum immanem Hydaspes intercipit . . . colliditur, quippe . . . cedunt; ceterum . . . alit. The sentence *Dyardines* to *currit* is merely a comment by Curtius needed to explain the unknown river Dyardines. The entire passage, sections 8 and 9, is a reproduction of Arr. 6, 1, 2 and 5; 6, 4, 4, and the modification in Strabo ἐν μὲν τῷ Ὑδάσπῃ κροκοδείλους ἰδόντα, ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἀκεσίνῃ κυάμους Αἰγυπτίους. The difficulties arose from

the blending by Curtius of a part of Hydaspes and of Acesines into a new name Dyardines, with a mistranslation of *κνάμους*, which ought to bear the same relation to the Acesines as *κροκοδείλους* does to the Hydaspes. Hence non crocodilos modo, sed etiam delphinos, with the addition ignotasque aliis gentibus beluas.

But the use of names by Curtius is a matter of rhetorical art, not merely of technical structure. Back of this is the fact that he does not mention Seleucus to whom Justinus devotes 15, 4, and whom Arrian in 7, 22, 5 pronounces the greatest of the successors of Alexander. Arrian has in 5, 16, 3 *τὴν φάλαγγα Σελεύκῳ καὶ Ἀντιγένει καὶ Ταύρων προσέταξεν ἄγειν*, which appears in Curt. 8, 14, 15 Tu, Antigene, et tu, Leonnate, et Tauron, invehimini in mediam aciem, changing the order of the names; and similar changes are characteristic of the work. Examples are in Curt. 3, 9, 7 Meleager et Ptolemaeus: Arr. 2, 8, 4 reversed; Curt. 3, 9, 9 Thraces quoque et Cretenses: Arr. 2, 9, 3; Curt. 3, 11, 10 Atizyes et Rheomithres et Sabaces: Arr. 2, 11, 8 καὶ Ῥεομίθρης καὶ Ἀτιζύης . . . καὶ Σανάκης. Diod. 17, 34, 5 has the same arrangement as Curtius, but *Τασιάκης* for Sabaces which evidently came from Arrian; 4, 12, 7 Ariobarzanes et Orontobates: Arr. 3, 8, 5; Curt. 7, 4, 23 Caranus et Erigyus: Arr. 3, 28, 2; Curt. 8, 5, 2 Haustanen et Catenen: Arr. 4, 22, 1. Fränkel, p. 287, quotes Curt. 5, 1, 43-45 and Diod. 17, 64, 5-6, and remarks "Hier harmonieren Curtius und Diodor fast vollständig mit einander". And the best proof of the harmony is the fact that Diodorus has the second and third of four names Ἀπολλόδωρον καὶ Μένητα, while Curtius has Menetem et Apollodorum. The same method is also followed in dealing with longer passages, as in 4, 10, 8 dextra Tigrim habebat, a laeva montes quos Gordyaeos vocant: Arr. 3, 7, 7 Ἄρας δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Τίγρητος ἦν διὰ τῆς Ἀσσυρίας χώρας, ἐν ἀριστερᾷ μὲν ἔχων τὰ Γορδυηνῶν ὄρη, ἐν δεξιᾷ δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν Τίγρητα.

The fact that Curtius has nearly a dozen ways of connecting three names indicates that he was ever on the lookout for the details of style. As an indication of his freedom in making combinations we give 5, 4, 20 Philotam et Coenon cum Amynta et Polyperconte; and in sec. 30 Philotas cum Polyperconte Amyntaque et Coeno; 6, 8, 17 Hephaestion et Craterus et Coenus et Erigyus; 6, 11, 10 Hephaestio autem et Craterus et

Coenus . . . Hephaestion cum Cratero et Coeno; 7, 7, 9 Hephaestio, Craterus et Erigyus. Taken as a whole Arrian and Curtius have many more personal details than are given by Diodorus and Plutarch, and we cannot but feel that stylistic considerations influenced the selection by Curtius. We find in 8, 1, 1 Hephaestionem uni, Coenon alteri duces dederat; in sec. 10 Hephaestionem et Artabazum opperiens. This is a differentiation of Arr. 4, 16, 2 and 3, who names Coenus and Artabazus as leaders of one of the divisions. Curt. 7, 10, 10 Peucolao . . . relicto . . . Ptolemaeus et Melamnidas peditum III milia et equites mille adduxerunt mercede militaturos, is intended to reproduce Arr. 4, 7, 2 Ἦκον δὲ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Ἐπόκιλλος καὶ Μελαμνίδας καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ τῶν Θρακῶν στρατηγὸς ἀπὸ θαλάσσης, οἱ τὰ τε χρήματα <τὰ> ἐν Μένητι πεμφθέντα καὶ τοὺς ἐνυμάρχους ὡς ἐπὶ θάλασσαν κατήγαγον.

The using of more names by Curtius than are found in Arrian is not infrequent. He has in 7, 3, 2 Caranum et Erigyium cum Artabazo et Andronico, while Arr. 3, 28, 2 has three of these in different order, Ἀρτάβαζόν τε καὶ Ἐριγύϊον καὶ Κάρανον. It is perhaps proper that Curtius should have *cum Artabazo et Andronico*, for they are in reverse order in Arr. 3, 23, 9. Compare also with the four given in 5, 4, 20 and 30 (see above), the three given in Arr. 3, 18, 6 Ἀμόνταν δὲ καὶ Φιλώταν καὶ Κοῖνον. Fewer names are also used. Curtius has in 8, 6, 20 Epimenes . . . fratri suo Eurylocho . . . quid pararetur, aperit, omitting the intermediary Charicles mentioned by Arrian in 4, 13, 7 Τῇ δὲ ὑστεραίᾳ Ἐπιμένης ὁ Ἀρσαίου τῶν μετεχόντων τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς φράζει τὴν πρᾶξιν Χαρικλεῖ τῷ Μενάνδρῳ, ἐραστῇ ἑαυτοῦ γεγονότι. Χαρικλῆς δὲ φράζει Εὐρυλόχῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ τῷ Ἐπιμένους. καὶ ὁ Εὐρύλοχος ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Λάγῳ τῷ σωματοφύλακι καταλέγει ἅπαν τὸ πρᾶγμα. ὁ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἔφρασε. Also in Curt. 4, 13, 28 Nicanor . . . Coenus . . . Polypercon . . . Amyntas, the names of Perdicas and Meleager are omitted from the list given in Arr. 3, 11, 9. Agathon is mentioned in Curt. 5, 1, 43 and again in 10, 1, 1 isdem fere diebus Cleander et Sitalces et cum Agathone Heracon superveniunt, qui Parmenionem iussu regis occiderant. But we find in Arr. 6, 27, 3 Ἦκον δὲ καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ οἱ ὑπολειφθέντες ἅμα Παρμενίῳ ἐπὶ τῆς στρατιᾶς τῆς ἐν Μηδίᾳ, Κλέανδρός τε καὶ Σιτάλκης καὶ Ἡράκων, τὴν πολλὴν τῆς στρατιᾶς καὶ οὗτοι ἄγοντες,

though in 3, 26, 3 he names Cleander, Sitalces and Menidas. It is possible that either Heracon or Menidas ought to be read in both passages of Arrian, though a parallel is offered by 3, 21, 10 where he has Σατιβαρζάνης, but in 3, 21, 1 Ναβαρζάνης, which is given several times by Curtius.

In reporting one incident at least we believe that Curtius has introduced an inference of his own. Two Greek accounts tell us that at a crisis in the battle of Arbela, Parmenio sent a message to Alexander: Plut. Alex. 32 ἀπέστειλε πρὸς 'Α. ἀγγέλους φράζοντας; Arr. 3, 15, 1 πέμπει Παρμενίων παρ' 'Α. σπουδῇ ἀγγελοῦντα. The words of Curtius are in 4, 15, 6 *propere igitur Polydamanta mittit*. The participle used by Arrian in the singular justified Curtius in naming Polydamas as a messenger, in harmony with the statement in 7, 2, 11 *Longe acceptissimus Parmenioni erat, proximus lateri in acie stare solitus*. Curtius in 7, 11 names Cophes as the messenger to treat with Arimazes. We do not have the account of Diodorus, but as Arrian, usually very careful in giving names, mentions merely a herald in 4, 19, 3, it is possible that here also Curtius has supplied the name.

All the body-guards of Alexander are named as actors in important situations: Curt. 8, 14, 15 *Ego (Alexander) Ptolemaeo Perdiccaque et Hephaestione comitatus*; 6, 8, 17 *Perdiccas et Leonnatus*, also in 10, 7, 8; 8, 1, 45-46 *a Ptolemaeo et Perdicca inhibetur . . . Lysimachus et Leonnatus etiam lanceam abstulerunt*; 8, 6, 22 *Ptolemaeum ac Leonnatum*; 9, 5, 15 *Subit inde Timaeus et paulo post Leonnatus, huic Aristonus supervenit*. The latter and Pithon are also mentioned in the discussion following the death of Alexander. Except for these two notices, and the fact that he is named as body-guard in Arr. 6, 28, 4 (compare 7, 5, 6) we might doubt the existence of Aristonus. His remark in 10, 6, 17 *placere igitur, summam imperii ad Perdiccam deferri, foreshadows the action of Pithon in 10, 7, 8 consilium Perdiccae exequi coepit*. It seems that Pithon should be read instead of Aristonus, unless we assume that Curtius used the name Aristonus merely to give to him the same artistic treatment as had been given to the ones mentioned above.

From what has been stated we may correct and explain the account in Curt. 9, 7, 12-14; and 9, 8, 1-2, the two parts being

separated by the story about Dioxippus. The parallel account is in Arr. 6, 14, 1-3. It states that 150 legates came to Alexander, bringing gifts, asking that he respect the freedom which had been maintained from the days of Dionysus, but agreeing to accept a satrap, pay tribute, and give hostages. Alexander asked for 1000 of their strongest men, which were sent together with 500 chariots and the outfit for them. Curtius in 9, 8, 1-2, names the gifts, and doubles the other items of Arrian—CCC erant equites, MXXX currus. But the latter is *prima facie* suspicious, for the XXX makes it altogether too definite. We find in 9, 7, 14 deditos in fidem accepit stipendio, quod Arachosiis utraque natio pensitabat, inposito. Praeterea II milia et D equites imperat. Without reference to what was to be written in the next chapter, this number seems calculated from Arrian's account, with three men to each chariot. The first part about the tribute is clearly wrong, for they had never been in bondage to any nation (Curt. 9, 7, 13). They brought gifts, and Alexander said that for tribute he would accept what they had brought. Read "stipendio, quod adhuc hospitiis utraque natio pensitabat, inposito."

There are three interpreted elements in Curt. 5, 1, 16 Alexander quartis castris ad Mennin urbem pervenit. Caverna ibi est, ex qua fons ingentem bituminis vim effundit, adeo ut constet Babylonios muros ingentis operis huius fontis bitumine interlitos esse. A certain number of stades are interpreted as four days of easy marching, another Greek expression, as the city Mennin, and the conclusion with *constet* is the interpretation of the general situation. This section stands between two portions of Curtius, secs. 10-15 and 17-45, similar to Diod. 17, 64-65, 1. Justinus has nothing bearing on the question, for he sums up the entire movement from Arbela to Susa in 11, 14, 8 donatis reffectisque militibus XXXIV diebus praedam recognovit—and Babylon is not mentioned. Arr. 3, 15, 5 and 16, 3-5 briefly states the main points, and there are found *σταδίους μάλιστα ἐς ἑξακοσίους* (15, 5), *εὐθύς* with finite verb, and *ἀπὸ γῶν* (16, 3). Plut. Alex. 35 has two pages about naphthā, and the suggestion about bitumen came to Curtius from a part of the first sentence *Ἐπιὼν δὲ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἄπασαν εὐθὺς ἐπ' αὐτῇ γενομένην ἐθαύμασε μάλιστα τό τε*

χάσμα τοῦ πυρὸς [ἐν Ἑκβατάνοις,] ὥσπερ ἐκ πηγῆς συνεχῶς ἀναφερομένον καὶ τὸ ῥεῦμα τοῦ νάφθα . . . Curtius, because of Arrian apperception, or by deliberate narrative contamination of Arrian and Plutarch, saw the words of Plutarch partially Arrianized, and from these words came the Latin of section 16.

## 2. Numbers.

Most of the numbers found in Curtius are from Diodorus, but a few are from Arrian. Many are the variations from both, but some of them are incidental to copying, as in 6, 2, 9 XXVI *milia talentum proxima praeda redacta erant: e quibus duodecim milia in congiarium militum absumpta sunt. Par huic pecuniae summa custodum fraude subtracta est.* This gives a part of Diod. 17, 74, 5 Παρὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν γαζοφυλακούντων παρέλαβεν ὀκτακισχιλίων ταλάντων ἀριθμόν, χωρὶς δὲ τούτων τὰ νεμηθέντα τοῖς στρατιώταις σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τοῖς ἐκπώμασιν ὑπῆρχε μύρια καὶ τρισχίλια τάλαντα, τὰ δὲ διακλαπέντα καὶ ἀρπαχθέντα πλείω τῶν εἰρημένων ὑπενοείτο. From it and Justinus 12, 1, 1 it can be seen that XIII should be restored in Curtius. That Curtius had a lively interest in the numbers given is shown by his reference to Clitarchus, and his remark in 5, 6, 8 ingens captivae pecuniae modus traditur, prope ut fidem excedat. Ceterum aut de aliis quoque dubitabimus aut credemus in huius urbis gaza fuisse C et XX *milia talentum: ad quae vehenda . . . iumenta et camelos et a Susis et a Babylone contrahi iussit.* Yet the number 120000 is given by Diod. 17, 71, 1. He is certainly to be commended for not reporting that of the *iumenta* there were according to Plut. Alex. 37 10000, and of camels 5000, or 3000 according to Diod. 17, 71, 2. These last numbers need not have astounded him for he makes Hermolaus say in 8, 7, 11 at tibi XXX\* *milia mulorum captivum aurum vehunt,* and in 7, 8, 8 he has 12000 rafts made in three days to carry across the Tanais the soldiers of Alexander, although many of them went across on inflated skins. In 5, 3, 23 he has XXX for *τριακοσίους* which has slipped into the text in Diod. 17, 68, 3. He has in 5, 2, 11 L *milia talentum argenti non signati forma, sed rudi pondere,* translating Arr. 3, 16, 7, and varying from Diod. 17, 66, 1. Here Curtius followed Arrian, but at many points no harmony can be established for the numbers used by different writers of the history of Alexander. For this reason only a few points will be considered here.

It is an interesting fact that the writers show less desire to state the number of the Greeks than of the Persians, though the numbers given could not be verified. The object seems to have been to exalt the heroism of the Macedonians in the presence of a foe far outnumbering themselves. It might seem that, if not too astoundingly large, one guess was as good as another. The loss of the Persians at Issus is put at 110000, but Justinus in 12, 9, 10 distributes these among the killed and captured. Plut. Alex. 18 places the number in the army at 600000. Arrian has the same number in 2, 8, 8 with ἐλέγετο. Curtius does not give the sum, but the items in 3, 9, 1 are from Arrian. Contrasted with these Diod. 17, 31, 2 and Just. 11, 9, 1 have 500000. The statements of the loss at Arbela have no connection with each other: Curt. 4, 16, 26, 40000; Arr. 3, 15, 6 300000 (ἐλέγοντο); Diod. 17, 61, 3 90000. The number of men in the army as given in Plut. Al. 31 is 1000000; in Arr. 3, 8, 6, with ἐλέγετο, the same number, plus 40000 cavalry, practically the same as the 45000 given in Curt. 4, 12, 13; but for the infantry Curtius has DC milia; and Just. 11, 12, 5 CD, the reverse order of the letters. Diod. 17, 53, 3 has 900000. Plut. Alex. 66 says that there were 120000 infantry and 15000 cavalry in the army of Alexander at the close of the Indian campaign. Curt. 8, 5, 4 gives 120000 as the number at the beginning of the campaign. See also Arrian Ind. 19, 5 δώκεκα μυριάδες αὐτῶ μάχιμοι εἵποντο.

Dosson, p. 188, N. 4, calls attention to Curt. 6, 6, 7 amicos vero et equites, hi namque principes militum, and suggests that ἐταῖροι ἱππεῖς was probably mistaken for ἐταῖροι καὶ ἱππεῖς. There is a mistake somewhat similar in Curt. 5, 4, 14 Cratero igitur ad custodiam relicto cum peditibus, quis adsueverat, et eis copiis, quas Meleager ducebat, et sagittariis equitibus M, assuming that there were 500 each of the bowmen and horsemen named in Arr. 3, 18, 4. There is the same explanation for Curt. 5, 12, 4: Arr. 3, 16, 2; Curt. 7, 6, 24: Arr. 4, 3, 7.

Arrian generally indicates the distance traveled by the days' journeys, and in some instances these are changed into stades by Curtius, 200, or 150, if the road is difficult, for each day's journey.

Agreement is noticeable at some points, as in Curt. 4, 10, 10 mille ferme: Arr. 3, 7, 7 οὐ πλείους ἢ χιλίους; Curt. 7, 5, 18



sexto demum die: Arr. 3, 29, 4 ἐν πέντε ἡμέραις. More frequently there is given a definite for the indefinite statement of the Greek: Curt. 3, 1, 8 sexaginta dierum inducias pacti: Arr. 1, 29, 2 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἧ ξυνέκειτο; Curt. 5, 4, 33 XL ferme equitibus: Arr. 3, 18, 9 ἐν ὀλίγοις ἱππεῦσι; Curt. 6, 4, 2 additis DC equitibus et totidem sagittariis, reversing the order in which the two classes are put in Arr. 3, 23, 2 Κράτερον δὲ τὴν τε αὐτοῦ τάξιν ἔχοντα καὶ τὴν Ἀμύντου καὶ τῶν τοξοτῶν ἔστιν οὗς καὶ ὀλίγους τῶν ἱππέων ἐπὶ Ταπούρων ἔστειλεν. Diodorus is followed in a larger number of instances: Curt. 5, 1, 39 XXXIII dies; Just. 11, 14, 8: Diod. 17, 64 4 πλείους δὲ τῶν τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν; Curt. 5, 1, 40 cum nongentis\* octoginta\* equitibus: Diod. 17, 65, 1 ἱππεῖς δὲ βραχὺ λείποντες τῶν χιλίων; Curt. 9, 3, 21 equitum V milia: Diod. 17, 95, 4 οὐ πολὺ λείποντες τῶν ἑξακισχιλίων; Curt. 9, 4, 15 nonaginta milia peditum . . . equitum X milia nongentaeque quadrigae: Diod. 17, 98, 1 κατέλαβε τοὺς ἐγχωρίους ἡθροικότας πεζοὺς μὲν πλείους τῶν ὀκτακισμυρίων, ἱππεῖς δὲ μυρίου, ἄρματα δ' ἑπτακόσια. Curt. 9, 6, 1 rex VII diebus curato vulnere: Diod. 17, 99, 5 ἐπὶ πολλὰς δὲ ἡμέρας. Compare the indefinite statement in Curt. 7, 9, 21 quadriduo rex longum itineris spatium emensus, with the definite one in Arr. 4, 6, 4 ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις διελθὼν χιλίους καὶ πεντακοσίους σταδίους τῇ τετάρτῃ ὑπὸ τὴν ἑω προσῆγε τῇ πόλει.

The three stages at the siege of Pimprama are given in Arr. 5, 22, 3 to 24, 5; by Curtius in sixteen lines in 9, 1, 14 seqq. The latter account is interesting as stating the loss for one stage not mentioned by Arrian. There is also in Curt. 7, 3, 23 VII milibus Caucasiorum et Macedonum praeterea militibus, quorum opera uti desisset, permissum in novam urbem considerare, a similar rhetorical dealing with Diod. 17, 83, 2 Κατόκισε δ' εἰς ταύτας τῶν μὲν βαρβάρων ἑπτακισχιλίουσ, τῶν δ' ἐκτὸς τάξεως συνακολουθούντων τρισχιλίουσ καὶ τῶν μισθοφόρων τοὺς βουλομένους. But, although it may seem to transgress the limits of valid criticism, we believe that the statement in Curt. 10, 1, 19 imperavit . . . ad urbem Syriae Thapsacum septingentarum carinas navium ponere: septiremis (ἀπ. εἰρ.) omnes esse, is a rhetorical outgrowth of Plut. Alex. 68 Καὶ πλοῖα παντοδαπὰ περὶ Θάψακον ἐπήγνυτο, καὶ συνήγοντο ναῦται καὶ κυβερνήται πανταχόθεν; cf. Arr. 7, 19, 3 and 23, 5. As the last word on this subject we can say that although Curtius may be inclined

to magnify numbers, as in 3, 11, 25 *ingens circa eam nobilium feminarum turba constiterat*: Arr. 2, 11, 9 *Καὶ ἄλλαι ἀμφ' αὐτὰς Περσῶν τῶν ὁμοτίμων γυναῖκες οὐ πολλάί*, we must commend his moderation in 9, 3, 24 *secundo amne defluxit*, XL *ferme stadia singulis diebus procedens*, when we compare his words with Pliny, N. H. 6, 60 *proditur Alexandrum nullo die minus stadia DC navigasse Indo nec potuisse ante menses V enavigare adiectis paucis diebus*.

### 3. *Time.*

The question of time is of little moment except in giving the ethical shading to the portrait of Alexander, and it is for this reason that Curtius paid little attention to chronology, either in general, or in particular cases. He begins 6, 2, 1 *sed ut primum instantibus curis laxatus est animus . . . excepere eum voluptates*. This is the only indication that it was some time after the death of Darius. We find in 8, 12, 4 *hinc ad flumen Indum sextis decimis castris pervenit*, and there is no indication of either the time or place of starting. *Interea* does not always indicate the period, as in 7, 6, 1; nor *deinde* the time when, as in 4, 8, 12; 5, 13, 3; 7, 6, 11. Taken as a whole the time element is much less important than the local.

### 4. *Place.*

Curtius did not have an exact knowledge of the regions in which Alexander operated. In 3, 4, 10 he locates in Cilicia some places lying outside; in 5, 4, 7 has the Araxes flow into the Medus; in 7, 10, 15 has Alexander cross the Ochus and the Oxus on one march; in 9, 9, 10 names the Etymandrus among the rivers of India; and, as does Arrian, he frequently mentions the Tanais. Still he comments freely and inexactly on local conditions. He has in 5, 13, 1 *Tabas—oppidum est in Paraetacene ultima—pervenit*. According to Arr. 3, 19, 2, after entering P., Alexander came into Media on the 12th day (sec. 3), then into Ecbatana in three days (sec. 4), and into Ragae in eleven days (20, 2). In 6, 5, 24 he locates the land of the Amazons, Hyrcaniae finitima . . . *circa Thermodonta amnem Themiscyrae incolentium campos*, and adds that the Queen was the ruler of all between the Caucasus mountain and the Phasis river. The first part is given in reverse order

by Strabo 11, 5, 4 C 505, and the second part is a variation from Diodorus 17, 77, 1. Though they bordered on India, he says in 7, 3, 4 Arachosios quorum regio ad Ponticum mare pertinet, subegit. When describing Bactria in 7, 4, 27 he speaks of the effect of the winds from the Pontic sea. We find in 5, 1, 11 euntibus a parte laeva erat Arabia, when it was on the right, and in the same way the right and left are sometimes confused in depicting battle scenes.

We read in Curt. 8, 12, 4 that when Alexander came to the Indus he found everything prepared for crossing; yet we are not told that he crossed. He then advanced to the Hydaspes, crossed, defeated Porus, and founded two cities—Curt. 9, 1, 6; Just. 12, 8, 8; Diod. 17, 89, 6; Arr. 5, 19, 4; but Plut. Alex. 61 mentions one. Arrian traces the course of Alexander from here to the Hypasis, stating his arrival at, and his crossing of, each river, both on the forward and the return march. Curtius tells of but one crossing in 9, 1, 8 hinc porro amne superato, without naming the river. Diod. 17, 90, 4 and Arr. 5, 21, 1 have περάσας τὸν ποταμόν, but Arrian mentions the Acesines in the preceding paragraph. We find in 9, 1, 12 hinc per deserta ventum est ad flumen Hyarotim; but Diod. 17, 90, 4 describes the region as a rich one, and Arr. 5, 21, 3 speaks of the flight of the inhabitants, so that *deserta* in Curtius must be taken as equal to *loca deserta fuga incolentium*. According to Arr. 5, 29, 5 Alexander returned to the Hydaspes, and did some repairing of the cities he had founded. But we find in Just. 12, 9, 1 inde Alexander ad amnem Acesinem pergit; per hunc in Oceanum devehitur. Diod. 17, 95, 3 also brings him to the Acesines. If the account stopped here we should have to say that according to Diodorus the return trip stopped at the Acesines, but sec. 5 states that having finished the boats he named the cities he had founded (on the Hydaspes) and sailed down the river. Curtius has the following about the terminus: 9, 3, 20 ad flumen Acesinem locat castra; sec. 21 iam in aqua classis, quam aedificari iusserat, stabat; sec. 23 oppida quoque duo condidit. But 9, 1, 6 tells of the founding of the cities on the Hydaspes, and sections 3–5, of building the fleet. The case may be briefly summed up. The testimony of Arrian is clearly for the Hydaspes, though he admits in 5, 29, 3, that a city was founded on the

Acesines, and that some things were prepared for the journey to the Ocean. Justinus has an epitome of the evidence of Diodorus; but this is apparently contradictory, and that of Curtius is certainly so.

*Hinc* is freely used and the reference to preceding movements is often not clear, as in 6, 2, 12; 6, 4, 20 and 23; 7, 6, 10; 8, 12, 4; 9, 1, 8. Similar to these is 8, 10, 7 *inde domita ignobili gente ad Nysam urbem pervenit*.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.